



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,048	11/13/2003	Isabelle Rollat-Corvol	5725.0425-01	9222
22852	7590	01/21/2009		
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			EXAMINER	SOROUSHI, LAYLA
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
01/21/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/706,048	Applicant(s) ROLLAT-CORVOL ET AL.
	Examiner LAYLA SOROUSH	Art Unit 1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-44 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 20-28 and 41-44 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3-19 and 29-40 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The response filed October 30, 2008 presents remarks and arguments submitted to the office action mailed April 30, 2008 is acknowledged.

Applicant's arguments over the 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph rejection of claims 1, 3-19, and 29-40 is persuasive. Therefore, the rejection is herewith withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments over the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 3-19,29-32 over Quack et al (US 4,150,216 – IDS) in view of Bhatt et al. (US 5164177) is not persuasive. Therefore, the rejection is herewith maintained.

Claims 33-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quack et al (US 4,150,216) and Bhatt et al. (US 5164177), as applied to claims 1,3-19,29-32 above, and further in view of Singleton et al. (US Pat No. 5,320,836 -- IDS) is not persuasive. Therefore, the rejection is herewith maintained.

Applicant's arguments over the Obvious Double Patenting rejection of U.S. Patent No. 6692730, 6039933, and US Applic. no. 10/320707 is not persuasive. Therefore, the rejection is herewith maintained.

The rejection over US Applic. no. 11/030296 is withdrawn in view of the abandonment of the case.

The rejections of record have been reiterated below for applicant's convenience:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-19,29-32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over

Quack et al (US 4,150,216 -- IDS) in view of Bhatt et al. (US 5164177).

Quack et al. teach hair-treatment compositions containing 0.1-10% branched water dispersible sulfo-group containing polyesters (abstract, col 18, lines 37-42). The polyesters of Quack et al. are made of the following radicals: dicarboxylic acids (e.g. succinic acid, azelaic acid), diols (e.g. ethylene glycol, propylene glycol), dicarboxylic acids carrying SO₃M (e.g. sodium sulfosuccinic acid) and multifunctional reagents (e.g. glycerin, pentaerythriol, trimethylolpropane, trimethylethane). (col 9-16). The composition of Quack et al. may contain alcohol, water, silicone oils, waxes, fats as well as quaternary ammonium compounds (e.g. pentaoxyethylstearylammmonium chloride (col 18, lines 9-26; col 19 Example 3). The compositions of Quack et al. may be in the form of tonics, lotions, and sprayable formulation (col 18 lines 2-8). The compositions are applied to hair to set hair, to improve its texture and to shape it (col 1 lines 5-9).

Quack et al. fails to teach a non-volatile silicone in an amount of 0.05-4% by weight.

Bhatt et al. teaches a hair composition which includes from about 0.1% to about 10%, particularly about 0.5% to about 10%, and preferably from about 1.0% to about 5.0%, by weight of a non-volatile silicone compound or other conditioning agent(s), preferably a water-insoluble, emulsifiable conditioning agent. The preferred non-volatile silicone compound is a polydimethylsiloxane compound, such as a mixture, in about a 3:1 weight ratio, of a low molecular weight polydimethylsiloxane fluid and a higher

molecular weight polydimethylsiloxane gum. The non-volatile polydimethylsiloxane compound is added to the composition of the present invention in an amount sufficient to provide improved combing and improved feel (softness) to the hair after shampooing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the non-volatile silicone in the hair composition. The motivation is from the teachings of Bhatt et al. that the non-volatile silicone provides improved combing and improved feel (softness) to the hair after shampooing. Hence a skilled artisan would have reasonable expectation of successfully producing a composition with the same efficacy and results.

Claims 33-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quack et al (US 4,150,216) and Bhatt et al. (US 5164177), as applied to claims 1,3-19,29-32 above, and further in view of Singleton et al. (US Pat No. 5,320,836 -- IDS).

Quack et al. and Bhatt et al. are discussed above.

Although the reference teaches sprayable composition, the reference does not explicitly teach the claimed the claimed propellant.

Singleton teaches aerosol hair care compositions containing conventional propellants such as aliphatic hydrocarbons and dimethyl ether (col 4 lines 34-66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use propellants taught by Singleton. The motivation to use the propellant is because Quack et al. teaches the use of sprayable hair compositions and Singleton teaches such sprayable compositions. Therefore, a skilled artisan would have

Art Unit: 1617

reasonable expectation of successfully producing a sprayable composition with the propellant.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 3-19, and 29-40 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1, 14-24, 26-27, and 29 of U.S. Patent No. 6039933. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the invention herein is drawn to a cosmetic composition for treating keratin fibers comprising: at least one branched sulphonate polyester; and at least one conditioning agent chosen from non-volatile silicones, cationic and amphoteric polymers and cationic and amphiphilic surfactants whereas the prior art teaches a cosmetic composition according to claim 1, wherein said

Art Unit: 1617

at least one fixing polymer is selected from anionic, cationic, amphoteric and non-ionic polymers.

It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan that the similar composition would be useful as a cosmetic for treatment of the hair because the prior art uses similar components as claimed.

Claims 1, 3-19, and 29-40 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6692730 . Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the invention herein is drawn to a cosmetic composition for treating keratin fibers comprising: at least one branched sulphonic polyester; and at least one conditioning agent chosen from non-volatile silicones, cationic and amphoteric polymers and cationic and amphiphilic surfactants whereas the prior art teaches a composition for washing keratinous materials, comprising, in a cosmetically acceptable aqueous medium, particles consisting essentially of aluminium oxide and having a mean primary size of less than 200 nm, at least one conditioning agent soluble or insoluble in the cosmetically acceptable aqueous medium, the conditioning agent being a cationic surfactant, a cationic polymer, a silicone, a vegetable oil, a ceramide, an anionic polymer, an amphoteric polymer or mixtures thereof, and at least one detergent surfactant, said composition not simultaneously containing an anionic surfactant and an amphoteric or nonionic surfactant.

It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan that a similar composition would be useful as a cosmetic for treatment of the hair because the prior art uses similar components as claimed.

Claims 1, 3-19, and 29-40 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1-19 of copending application No. 10/320707 . Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the invention herein is drawn to a cosmetic composition for treating keratin fibers comprising: at least one branched sulphonic polyester; and at least one conditioning agent chosen from non-volatile silicones, cationic and amphoteric polymers and cationic and amphiphilic surfactants whereas the prior art teaches a Styling composition packaged in an aerosol device, comprising from 45% to 65% by weight of a liquid phase containing, in dissolved or finely dispersed form in a cosmetically acceptable aqueous or aqueous-alcoholic liquid medium, at least one branched sulphonic polyester, and from 35% to 55% by weight of dimethyl ether as propellant, the total water content of the liquid phase being between 65% and 99% by weight.

It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan that a similar composition would be useful as a cosmetic for treatment of the hair because the prior art uses similar components as claimed.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments with respect to the rejected claims have been considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant argues a composition comprising a conditioning agent have unexpected properties of disentanglement, body, softness, feel, styling power, and restyling power on hair. Thus a composition comprising a branched sulphonic polyester and a non-volatile silicone conditioning agent in an amount of 0.05% to 4% is unexpectedly superior as compared with a composition comprising only a branched sulphonic polyester.

Examiner states that the obviousness rejection was based on Quack et al (US 4,150,216 -- IDS) in view of Bhatt et al. (US 5164177). Quack clearly teaches a composition comprising a branched sulphonic polyester. However, the reference fails to teach a non-volatile silicone conditioning agent in an amount of 0.05-4% by weight. The Bhatt et al. reference is incorporated to show that a non-volatile polydimethylsiloxane compound added to a composition to provide improved combing [disentanglement] and improved feel (softness) [softness, feel] to the hair. Additionally, the compositions of Bhatt et al. are hair styling aids that are sprayed onto the hair from an aqueous composition, to provide the hair with a particular shape or configuration [body, styling power, and restyling power]. Hence, applicants arguments that the conditioning agent added to the branched sulphonic polyester has unexpected superior properties of disentanglement, body, softness, feel, styling power, and restyling power on hair is not persuasive. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the non-volatile silicone in the hair composition. The

motivation is from the teachings of Bhatt et al. that the non-volatile silicone provides improved combing and improved feel (softness) to the hair. And that the compositions would provide the hair with a particular shape or configuration. Hence a skilled artisan would have reasonable expectation of successfully producing a composition with the same efficacy and results.

Applicants' argument over claims 33-40 rejections depends on the validity of the previous arguments which were not found persuasive.

With respect to the obviousness-type double patenting rejections the Applicant argues that the claimed reference is to a composition comprising at least one branched sulphonate polyester and at least one conditioning agent. The Examiner states that the compositions of the rejections are similar. See below:

U.S. Patent No. 6039933 teaches a pressurized cosmetic compositions comprising anionic fixing polymers generally used are polymers containing groups derived from carboxylic, sulphonate or phosphoric acid and can also contain conditioning agents.

U.S. Patent No. 6692730 teaches a composition for washing keratinous materials, in particular hair, which comprises, anionic polymer which can be used in the present invention, there may be mentioned in particular polymers comprising groups derived from carboxylic, sulphonate or phosphoric acids and at least one conditioning agent.

Copending application No. 10/320707 teaches a styling composition packaged in an aerosol device, comprising a branched sulphonated polyester and conditioners.

The rejection of Copending application No. 11/030296 is withdrawn in view of the abandonment of the case.

The arguments are not persuasive and the rejection is made **FINAL**.

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Layla Soroush whose telephone number is (571)272-

5008. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan, can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Layla Soroush/

Examiner, Art Unit 1617

/SREENI PADMANABHAN/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1617